

REMARKS

Applicant traverses the election of species requirement imposed in the Office Action mailed August 26, 2003, on the grounds that the species are not patentably distinct, but are variant embodiments of the same invention.

Should this traversal not be satisfactory to the Examiner, Applicant makes the following statement. Having reviewed the election of species requirement, Applicant believes that Species II should concern Figures 1-6 and 11-16, and not Figures 1-2 and 11-16 as stated by the Examiner, for the following reasons:

1. Figures 1 and 2 are rather general figures showing a device for blocking the legs of a passenger with two flaps.
2. Figures 3-6 show details of the flaps' opening/closing mechanism of said device.
3. Figures 7-10 and Figures 11-16 represent, respectively, two variant embodiments of the device wherein the closure movement of the flaps is automatically controlled by the closure movement of the harness, the embodiment represented by Figures 7-10 using a cable, while the embodiment represented by Figures 11-16 uses an intermediate cam.

If the species identified by the Examiner as II can be changed to cover Figures 1-6 and 11-16, Applicant would elect Species II with the following claims readable thereon: 1-5 and 7-16.

In the case the definition of Species II is not so changed, Applicant elects Species I, upon which the following claims are readable: 1-6 and 11-16.

Respectfully submitted

By: Clifford W. Browning
Clifford W. Browning
Reg. No. 32,201
Woodard, Emhardt et al. LLP
Bank One Center/Tower
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137
(317) 634-3456

#242114